Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2009

REMARKS

The Office Action of February 10, 2009, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 8-13 and 19-21 have been amended and claims 22-29 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 8-13, 19-29 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10, 11 and 21 stand objected to for including a trademark or trade name. Applicants have amended the claims to remove the use of the trademark or trade name. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 8-13 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Towne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3.918.053, "Towne").

Amended claim 8 recites, inter alia,

"a first surface comprising a hollow having a shape of a symbol, wherein a portion of the first surface forming the hollow is configured to transmit light emitted by a light source; and a second surface located on the opposite side of the plastic object with respect to said first surface, wherein the symbol is visually perceptible through the second surface when light is emitted from a side that said first surface faces, wherein the first and second surfaces are formed of a homogenous material and wherein the hollow does not extend to the second surface."

Towne fails to teach or suggest each and every one of the recited features of claim 8. For example, nowhere does Towne teach or suggest a first surface having a hollow in a shape of a symbol, wherein the hollow does not extend to a second surface on which the symbol is visually perceptible when light is emitted from a side that the first surface faces. Instead, Towne describes face plate 1 having slots 2-8 in which lens element 40 may be received such that the front surface of the lens is visible through the slot. Col. 3, Il. 39-48; Col. 4, Il. 4-12. Accordingly, slots 2-8 clearly extend from a first surface to a second surface on which the symbol or element is to be visually perceptible (i.e., through the entirety of face plate 1). In contrast, claim 8 recites that the hollow does not extend to a second surface on which the symbol

Appln, No.: 10/510,443

Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2009

is visually perceptible when light is emitted. Additionally, element 17 of Towne describes a socket in which LEDs such as LED 27 and 28. Accordingly, element 17 clearly extends through the entire housing 10 and thus, does not meet the claimed feature of a hollow that does not extend to a second surface on which a symbol is visually perceptible when light is emitted. Claim 8 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 19 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 8 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

Claims 9-13, 20 and 21 are dependent claims and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

New Claims

Claims 22-29 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the features recited in the new claims may be found throughout the originally filed Specification and Drawings.

Claim 26 recites, inter alia.

"a first surface comprising a recess having a shape of a symbol, wherein a portion of the first surface forming the recess is configured to transmit light emitted by a light source; and a second surface located on an opposite side of the object with respect to said first surface, wherein the symbol is visually perceptible through the second surface when light is emitted from a side that said first surface faces, wherein the first and second surfaces are formed of a homogenous material and wherein the recess does not extend to the second surface."

As discussed above, Towne describes a face plate 1 and a housing 10, each of which includes apertures through which various elements are inserted and extend. Thus, Towne clearly fails to teach or suggest a first surface comprising a recess that does not extend to a second surface located on an opposite of an object with respect to the first surface. Accordingly, claim 26 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 22-25 and 27-29 are dependent claims and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 23 recites "wherein the first and second surfaces and the hollow are integrally formed of the homogenous material." Nowhere does Towne teach or

Appln. No.: 10/510,443

Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2009

suggest such a feature. In fact, Towne describes that assembly is required between faceplate 1, lens 40/41 and housing 10. Accordingly, claim 23 is allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3000.

By:

Respectfully submitted, BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th Street, N.W.

Suite 1200

Washington, D.C. 20005 Tel: (202) 824-3000

Fax: (202) 824-3000

Dated: May 8, 2009

/Chunhsi Andy Mu/

Chunhsi Andy Mu Registration No. 58,216